

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING

197980

Barrow, Alaska

In Re: )  
 )  
Amendment to the Northeast )  
National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska )  
Integrated Activity Plan/ )  
Environmental Impact Statement )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

Barrow, Alaska  
Inupiat Heritage Center  
August 12, 2004  
6:00 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

BOB SCHNEIDER - Bureau of Land Management,  
Fairbanks, Alaska  
  
SUSAN CHILDS, Bureau of Land Management,  
Anchorage, Alaska  
  
STEVE ELLSWORTH - ENSR, Anchorage, Alaska

Hearing Officer  
and Translator: Arnold Brower Jr., Barrow, Alaska  
  
Court Reporter: Janice Scott, Metro Court Reporting,  
Anchorage, Alaska

\* \* \* \*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. SCHNEIDER .....	3
PRESENTATION (In Inupiaq) BY MR. BROWNER .....	5
INVOCATION BY KENNY TOOVAK, SR. ....	5
PUBLIC STATEMENTS .....	6
STATEMENT BY CHARLES BROWER .....	6
STATEMENT BY PERCY NUSUNGINYA .....	11
STATEMENT BY GEOFF CARROLL .....	12
STATEMENT BY EDWARD ITTA .....	17
STATEMENT BY KENNY TOOVAK, SR. ....	20
STATEMENT BY MARIE CARROLL .....	21
STATEMENT BY ELSIE ITTA .....	26
STATEMENT BY RICHARD GLENN .....	28
STATEMENT BY BEVERLY HUGO .....	32
STATEMENT BY ROBERT EDWARDSSEN, SR. ....	34
STATEMENT BY JAMES PATKOTAK .....	36
STATEMENT BY LINDA WENNING .....	39
STATEMENT BY WARREN MATUMEAK .....	40
STATEMENT BY DOUGLAS EDWARDSSEN .....	41
STATEMENT BY PAUL NINGEOK .....	42
STATEMENT BY JOHNNY BROWER .....	45
STATEMENT BY KEN DONAJKOWSKI .....	48
STATEMENT BY CHARLES OKAKOK .....	52
STATEMENT BY EDITH VORDERSTRASSE .....	54
STATEMENT BY GEORGE EDWARDSSEN .....	56

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)**

STATEMENT BY MAX AHGEAK .....	60
-------------------------------	----

STATEMENT BY MAE M. AKPIK .....	61
STATEMENT BY TAQULIK HEPHA .....	63
STATEMENT BY JANICE MEADOWS .....	67
STATEMENT BY WILLIAM ITTA .....	69
STATEMENT BY RICHARD HUTCHINSON .....	71
STATEMENT BY JENNY AHKIVAGAK .....	72
STATEMENT BY HARRY BROWER, JR. ....	73
STATEMENT BY CRAIG GEORGE .....	77
END OF PROCEEDINGS .....	82

\* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

(On record)

MR. SCHNEIDER: I have a brief couple of announcements before we get started with the actual meeting. I want to first welcome you to this meeting to take public comment concerning some proposed plan amendments to the 1998 Northeast NPR-A Plan.

My name is Bob Schneider. I am the field manager for the Bureau of Land Management's Northern Field Office in Fairbanks. With me this evening to be the hearing's officer and translator is Arnold Brower, Jr. from the North Slope Bureau.

A while back in June I was here in this very room at a subsistence advisory panel meeting. There's a few members, Arnold's a member, James Patkotak is a member, and we spoke about the Northeast Plan Amendment and I know that there was public expectation that evening that this was the hearing on Northeast Plan Amendment, and it was only until we got about three quarters the way through the meeting that I realized that that's why a lot of people were here, because normally Subsistence Advisory Panel meetings don't draw a big crowd. So, I said at that time that we would be having a public hearing in July, July the 9th, and because of requests made by Mayor Ahmagoak, we extended the comment period through the 23rd of August and we changed the dates of the hearings to better accommodate people from the North Slope, especially people from the North Slope Borough and those that were involved in the Whaling Commission meetings to be able to make comment and to give the public more of an opportunity to

look at the document and understand what it was saying.

We're going to start off with an information briefing. Some of you saw a portion of that briefing at the Subsistence Advisory Panel meeting. I have actually cut it down. We're going to do something that we have been doing the last two evenings when we were in Nuiqsut and Atkasuk, and that is that Arnold's is going to do the entire presentation in the Native language so that we don't extend the time at me doing it in English and Arnold doing it in Inupiaq, but the slides are in English, so hopefully those of you that don't understand Inupiaq will still understand what the slides are saying, and this way we will be able to make sure that those that need to have a more complete translation of the presentation will be able to get it.

After that, we will receive public testimony. Your comments about the plan, your views about this plan. And we will stay as long as anyone wants to speak. It says 7:00 to 9:00, but we'll stay here as long as anyone wants to speak, so that's not - - don't feel compelled by the time limit.

And the last thing is, being a translator is a very difficult job and Arnold does an excellent job in translation from people that are speaking in Inupiaq to English, so that we can get it on the official record, but if in the process you feel like you need to clarify something that Arnold may have said, feel free to speak up, but let us know so that we make sure that we capture your comments accurately. And I know Arnold has worked very very hard in trying to do that, but if we're not doing what you're saying, we want to make sure that you do that.

So, that's basically all I wanted to say, except again, welcome and we'll go ahead and begin the presentation.

CHAIR BROWER: (Translates presentation in Inupiaq) Okay.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Before we begin the real meat of this hearing, I would like for you to all rise and Kenny Toovak is going to lead us in an invocation before we actually start the public testimony. So, Kenny, would you do that for us please?

MR. TOOVAK: (Gives brief invocation in English and Inupiaq).

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you Mr. Toovak, Sr., for that opening prayer for this evening's Bureau of Land Management, Northeast National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska, NPR-A Plan Amendment Public Hearing. The public hearing is now open. I will use the sign-up sheet and call folks by the order that they signed up tonight, and I will expect, and we expect for you to state your name, who you represent and if you have a written comment, to give it to our clerk here.

And before I continue, this is not the only period that you can submit your comments, as we stated, you have 'til August 23. You can contact Susan Childs, who is in the orange back there, at -- if you have a pen and pencil, her phone number is (907-271-1985), or if you have a computer, you can do electronic e-mail and comments can be submitted by accessing the website developed for this project at (<http://nepra.ensr.com>).

(Translates) Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Office, 222

West 7th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7599. (Translates)

I will ask that all the speakers come to this microphone at the podium and give your testimony or your comments there.

Charles Brower? (Translates)

**STATEMENT BY CHARLES BROWER**

Good evening. My name is Charles Brower. I work for the Wildlife Department as a director for the North Slope Borough. I'm here on behalf of the Mayor to make some comments on the Northeast NPR-A Draft EIS.

I would like to start off on the comments on the process:

The three alternatives presented in the Draft Plan are not a sufficient range of choice. In particular, if BLM has made the decision to convert the existing 79 stipulations into performance-based mitigation measures, then Alternative A is meaningless.

It should be clear that someone testifying or commenting does not have to choose one of the three alternatives, but may combine parts of them or craft an entirely new proposal.

The North Slope Borough testimony and comments should be given deference in BLM's decision. It is our borough residents who will be most directly affected by any decision to either expand areas open to industrial activity in the NPR-A, or to weaken existing conditions applicable to those activities.

North Slope governments, groups, and residents were not appropriately consulted before the intent to consider this proposed amendment was announced. We have not been appropriately consulted as it has been prepared. Consultation must be

012  
Alternatives

015  
NEPA  
PRocess

meaningful, prolonged, and take place in North Slope communities.

The timeline for this process is far too short. Without time for open and meaningful dialogue between all parties, our comments on complex issues must be more simple and less thoughtful than they should be. Consensus and compromise even among North Slope groups is not possible without time to meet in workshop settings and talk things out.

Those are some of the comments on process. And some of the comments are key issues:

The North Slope Borough supports oil exploration and development in the NPR-A that maintains healthy wildlife populations and protects subsistence opportunities. But a responsible balance must be struck between the protection of critical areas and development.

The areas closed under the 1998 Plan should remain closed. We are not aware of significant new wildlife or subsistence data or industry technology that has been reported and discussed with us since 1998 that would justify opening areas that are now closed to leasing or surface facilities. Even if the protections provided by the 79 stipulation of the 1998 Plan are preserved or enhanced in some other format on the areas governed by those stipulations, that does not justify opening 387,000 new acres to leasing and operations. After significant consultation and compromise, it was determined in the 1998 Plan that no package of mitigation measures could provide appropriate protection within certain critical areas. Those areas were closed. Those areas should remain closed.



019  
Stips &  
ROPs

All protections afforded by the existing prescriptive mitigation measures must be carried forward if there is a shift to performance-based mitigation. We will not support a change from existing prescriptive mitigation structure to the proposed performance-based structure unless we can be assured that all protections provided by the 79 stipulations of the 1998 Plan are preserved or enhanced.

020  
Stips &  
ROPs

All exception clauses must be eliminated or significantly narrowed. The exception clauses contained in many of the proposed performance based measures are unacceptable. The economics of a project should never be permitted to dictate whether or to what degree a protective measure is applied. The Draft argues that mitigation measures would reduce impacts of certain facilities or operations, but does not adequately analyze the effects of those facilities or operations if exception clauses are allowed to reduce the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.

021  
Consultation

Small points in definitions can have big impacts on management. A definition of consultations must never include one party simply "informing" another of its intentions. Gravel mine sites must be recognized as permanent facilities, and be subject to all restrictions on the placement of such facilities.

022  
Subsistence

The subsistence users themselves must confirm any new subsistence information. If BLM has new information relating to subsistence species or uses in the Planning Area, that information should be shared, discussed, analyzed and corroborated with the affected North Slope communities as was

done in a subsistence workshop during preparation of the 1998 EIS.

023  
Cumulative

There must be some mechanism for recognizing and mitigating the potential cumulative impacts of multiple industrial operations within and outside of the Planning Area. The oil industry has made progress in being able to develop with a smaller footprint, but it is predicted that oil in NPR-A will be found in many small fields, resulting in a web of wells, pipelines, and roads. This expanding web of development will create incremental and increasingly significant cumulative impacts on wildlife and subsistence hunting.

The linkage between onshore and offshore operations and impacts must be thoroughly analyzed including the potential for a westward expansion of onshore facilities and staging areas to stimulate increased offshore industry interest.

025  
Cabins &  
Camps

The use and enjoyment of all long-term cabins and campsites must be protected. The EIS must analyze how any change in management is likely to affect cabin and campsite users. Buffer zones prohibiting surface facilities around all established cabins and campsites must be maintained. Whether or not structures exist on these sites, they must be recognized as subsistence use sites critical to the nutritional and cultural well being of our residents. The issue must be clearly highlighted in the document.

All essential habitat of Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd must be protected. Hunters from seven of our villages take animals from the Teshekpuk Lake Caribou herd, making it the most

important herd on the North Slope from a subsistence standpoint.

This herd is not habituated to industrial activities, and would likely be displaced from preferred habitat if development is permitted and occurs in areas now closed. The result would be population effects on the herd and significant effects subsistence harvests.

027  
Stips &  
ROPs

A performance-based mitigation system requires a long-term commitment to fund research, monitoring and enforcement. Performance based mitigation can only work if there is a clear requirement for a long-term comprehensive research and monitoring to establish baseline data and impacts associated with industrial operations. There must also be the ability to require significant alterations in industrial operations if impacts are identified.

Those are the comments from the Mayor's office. Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Charlie. (Translates statement in Inupiaq) I see that Percy Nusunginya is next.

**STATEMENT BY PERCY NUSUNGINYA**

(Translates his statement in Inupiaq)

I am first an Inupiat and my ancestors from my father's side were whalers since time immemorial. We have resided at Utkeagvik from that time and we have never left. We have depended on the land and the sea for our survival and existence.

Good evening. My name is Percy Nusunginya. Presently I am the president of the Native Village of Barrow Inupiat Traditional Government Council. A federally recognized Tribal

Government with self-governance and compacting status.

For the people, the fish, the mammals and the animals to exist, we all require land. The issue here is the land. For us, the people to subsist, we must have land to hunt the animals we depend on for our survival.

The land issue must be settled as to the underlying laws, land orders and the military withdrawals must be adhered to.

The Arctic, our homeland, have been defined as North and West of the Porcupine, Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers and the Aleutian Chain.

Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Percy. Our next speaker is Geoff Carroll.

**STATEMENT BY GEOFF CARROLL**

Good evening. My name is Geoff Carroll. Many of you know that I work for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, but today I'm speaking as a private citizen, as a resident of the North Slope. My views do not represent the viewpoints of any particular agency.

I would like to begin by saying that I am sure that oil development can take place on the North Slope while maintaining healthy wildlife populations. However, this is only true if we have a balanced approach and adequately protect crucial wildlife habitat areas.

One of the major differences between the three proposed Alternatives is that Alternative A prevents development in the most critical habitat areas for caribou, and Alternatives B and C

open the areas up to leasing and potential development. There are several characteristics about the Teshekpuk Caribou herd and the geography of the area that make me feel that it is important to choose an alternative that protects the critical caribou habitat areas.

First, the Teshekpuk herd is a very important subsistence resource for North Slope residents. Most of the caribou harvested in most of the North Slope villages are from the Teshekpuk herd.

Second, it is very important for pregnant cows to get to and use the calving area, which is south, east, and north of Teshekpuk Lake. Over ninety percent of pregnant cows calve in this traditional calving area. During years when cows can't get back to the calving area, calving success has been much lower than years when most of the cows did get back. Third, there is a narrow corridor of land between the east side of Teshekpuk Lake and the Kogru River, which nearly all of the parturient cows must travel through shortly before or after calving to get to insect relief areas. Cows with calves are very sensitive to disturbance, so we have the most important segment of the population passing through this corridor during the time of year when they are having calves and are most sensitive to disturbance. Development in this corridor and the calving area south of there could have a detrimental effect on the herd.

In a choice between the presented Alternatives, I would choose the land protection aspect of Alternative A because it is the only one that adequately protects these critical habitat

areas by making them either unavailable for leasing or prevents surface activity. However, I also think that if we could get away from the accelerated schedule of this planning process and have an adequate period of consultation, we could probably figure out a reasonable plan that would open more areas for leasing while protecting the most important wildlife habitat areas.

So far the public input in the development of this draft plan has been totally inadequate. It is essential that, in order to develop a legitimate plan, you engage in serious consultation with representatives from North Slope villages and knowledgeable biologists.

Another major change from the 1998 Plan to the current preferred Alternative is the change from prescriptive to performance stipulations. This is acceptable as long as the performance based stipulations provide all the protection contained in the existing prescriptive measures. In some cases you have done a good job of this. The requirements for seven-foot pipelines and for separating roads from pipelines are very good. However, other stipulations in the preferred Alternatives are weakened by qualifying words, like wiggly words. For instance, when a stipulation states that a mitigative measure may be required instead of must be required, it takes away much of the protective power of the stipulation.

Another weakness in the Plan is the use of exception clauses in the stipulations. Exception clauses allow the economics of a project to dictate to what degree protective measures are applied. This was brought to light in the Alpine

Satellite Development Project where BLM will apparently use an exception clause to allow a drill pad in the Fish Creek Subsistence Setback for economic reasons. As you saw on one of the maps, the Fish Creek Subsistence area was designated as a place where no surface structures were supposed to be allowed. This giant loop-hole takes away much of the protection that stipulations have to offer. A setback should be a setback. It shouldn't just be a setback until oil is found.

I will address individual stipulations in detail in written comments; but in summary, most of the performance stipulations will be acceptable if the qualifying words and the exception clauses can be eliminated or greatly reduced.

I found the section on caribou in the Affected Environment Section in the EIS to be incomplete, lacking in the most recent information and inaccurate in some cases. One of the inaccuracies is the statement on page 349, where it states; "After calving most of the caribou spread out from the calving areas to the east, west and south." This is completely false and is very significant to the decisions that are being made through this process. The fact is that, as I previously mentioned, nearly all of the parturient cows move north through the narrow corridor between Teshekpuk Lake and the Kogru River. It would be very difficult to have any development in this corridor without the risk of seriously affecting the population. However, this corridor is part of the area that BLM has proposed to open to leasing and development. I would like to ask that before final decisions are made, you obtain accurate and up to date

information and take it into account before key decisions, like opening this corridor to development are made.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we all want to have petroleum development take place on the North Slope without detrimentally affecting the wildlife populations. That's what the people of the North Slope, the agencies and the oil industry want. With that common goal, and if we use a balanced approach, we should be able to work together and make that happen.

Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Geoff. (Translating in Inupiaq) I see Edward Itta. Good evening, Edward.

**STATEMENT BY EDWARD ITTA**

Good evening. I have written testimony I want to read in English first and I'll translate into Inupiaq. Okay?

CHAIR BROWER: Yes. Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Edward Saggan Itta, a lifelong resident and Inupiat from Barrow. I am a hunter and a whaler and value very much the area that you are asking for testimony on tonight.

I currently hold title to a Native Allotment at the very eastern shore of Teshekpuk Lake. My father and mother who were here tonight, also own an allotment on the western side of Teshekpuk Lake. The very areas that we are talking of tonight. I would like to state that I feel that it is my responsibility as an individual and Inupiat, to ensure that this piece of land with its abundant wildlife and fauna that has been granted to me, will be protected in perpetuity for my children, grandchildren and



fellow Inupiat far into the future. This is the area where my father, his other brothers and sisters, his parents and other relatives grew up in and subsisted prior to moving to Barrow. So, it is very special to me personally as part of my heritage, that I feel I must pass on to the following generations of our family and my fellow Inupiat.

I've been fortunate to go around the lake a few times by boat with my family, and also in the winter of going around the lake and being around the area by snow machine. After looking at a tv special one time, in my own mind, I call this the Serengti of the Arctic, pretty much as the Serengti they refer to in Africa.

I could go on and on about some of my feelings of mistrust and anxiety over this process tonight, but I would rather be straightforward and to the point as to my feelings about the proceedings, so I will be brief. But understand that my feelings are very strong and sincere.

My preference tonight, -- and I am speaking as an individual tonight and not representing any group. My preference tonight is to remain with Alternative A. I think that this is a position that was a best case compromise between all affected parties when this issue first came up.

As I sense it now, the federal Government seems bound and determined to open up the area further with the proposal of Alternative B.

I sense in the end that that is what our quote, "Great White Fathers" (to quote other famous Native Americans from the

past), in Washington, D.C. want to do, and will get regardless of our testimonies tonight. Whether it be for economic, national security, political reasons, that is some of my thoughts on that area tonight.

So with that thought in mind, I implore you to leave the narrow corridor between Teshekpuk Lake and Kogru Bay where the caribou migrate both North and South closed. Barring that, I am asking that it be the last area that is leased prior to the implementation of Stipulation 29 on the 79 Stipulations, and I am asking that the appropriate Federal Agencies develop baseline data on all wildlife and fauna prior to approving this additional acreage for leasing.

I further state that in Stipulation 29, while it is a compromise, somewhere the number of \$500,000 as a limit by all lessees for the study is stated. I feel that this number is inadequate.

My last point is to state emphatically and in no uncertain terms to leave the Teshekpuk Lake itself closed to any possibility of leases being opened on the water itself. There are too many unknowns at this time to consider such a possibility.

I have stated openly that I have become very cynical and at times hostile to the EIS process of our federal government, but realize also that we must work with our federal authorities and see if they will truly at least listen to us, and perhaps meet us halfway in addressing our concerns.

I say this without malice, anger or hatred toward any of

my fellow human beings, and I thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight.

(Translates in Inupiaq) Thank you very much. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Edward. Kenneth Toovak, Sr.?

**STATEMENT BY KENNETH TOOVAK, SR.**

I don't have no paper to look at. I don't have anything that I could tell you that I wrote in the paper. (Speaks in Inupiaq) (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Kenneth Toovak, Sr. has -- is the man that testified and in recanting, the -- in times past when this community had never seen any oil and gas industry or folks -- or businesses that have come to the Arctic Slope, in those days they went and hunted caribou for days, and to find caribou they would have to camp overnight and sometimes more than several days to get to the caribou, up to 100 to 150 miles from Barrow. And today the caribou are close by and, you know, it's even surprising for him that even lately he drove up the Gas Well Road and the caribou run up to the gas well and hop right over it and in some places, or walk through it because of the causeways and stuff. And this is -- he witnessed this.

So, he's weighing the facts of the benefits of what the oil and gas industry has brought to our communities insofar, and what we would probably have been in a dilemma if oil had never been discovered in Prudhoe Bay. So, he's emphasizing a need that we need to find a common ground. I think it mirrors -- nearly mirrors the concerns that were raised by Geoff Carroll earlier.

And this is -- and it, you know, we have to weigh these consequences, whether we don't -- he emphasizes the critical issue with what the land, our land is sensitive, the caribou are sensitive and -- and in Edward Itta's testimony, for instance on Teshekpuk and Kogru corridor, those are critical issues. Our land is very sensitive and this is something that he wants to bring to the table and have it be part of the comments tonight.

He had much to say, but he wanted to save some time for others that might have significant comments as well and appreciates this opportunity to submit his comments.

CHAIR BROWER: With that, Marie Carroll?

**STATEMENT BY MARIE CARROLL**

Good evening. I have two Inupiat names, Qaquan and Akugluk, you know me as Marie Carroll. As children we were taught to respect all life and we are told not to mistreat animals. These lessons are learned by example and stories; such as the day my grandmother, Qataq, boiled a bunch of small birds my brother and sisters and I had got. She said, you shoot them, you eat them. We regretted having so many birds and that our brother George was a bull's eye shooter with a bow and arrow. My mother told us stories. In one story someone had taken a small live bird and plugged all of its feathers except for its wings, the bird was let go and it flew up into the sky and was not seen again. Shortly afterward, the person who did this became ill and died suffering with pain. I vowed never to mistreat wildlife that day.

Respect for all life is part of our living culture, from

the names we carry to the animals we hunt and eat. To me, Teshekpuk Lake area is not just another place on the North Slope.

The western culture looks at the surface of the land like ANWR and they want to protect it with all of their might and power. We've seen that.

The Inupiat looks at land and values a place based on its life sustaining potential such as Teshekpuk Lake area. In this area, even wildlife somehow knows that if they can just get there, it will provide for them too. I am amazed that geese from all directions, although they may have been born in the Yukon, Canada and islands along the Beaufort Sea, they converge at Teshekpuk Lake area and when they are unsuccessful in nesting in those regions. How do they know that this area will sustain them and give them a safe place to molt?

Even the caribou know that their calves have a better chance of surviving if they can just get to the narrow corridor to the east of the lake. The Teshekpuk caribou herd somehow gets enough sustenance from this area to winter in the North Slope, unlike other Arctic caribou herds that head south. It is from this herd that the Inupiat who live here get the majority of their year's supply of tuttu meat. Besides the caribou herd, the lake is also teeming with fish that migrate to the major rivers that provide sustenance for our families.

Teshekpuk Lake area is once again being considered for oil and gas leasing by BLM. This area was considered to be so important to this region and for its wildlife; it was excluded in the 1998 Plan. There is no change in its importance to the people

and the wildlife resources. During the development of the NPR-A NE 1998 Plan, there were village meetings, subsistence workshops and wildlife workshops that contributed to developing a compromise plan.

Considering that there are major changes being proposed by BLM's preferred Alternative B to the 1998 Plan, you would think that the least our government would do is to engage in serious consultation with the North Slope villages and with biologists who have significant and relevant data on wildlife in this area. You, the government, are asking people who would be most impacted by development, what they think about having oil and gas activity on Teshekpuk Lake area. I would not be satisfied until BLM and our governments gave us adequate time to deal with the proposed changes as a community. We had consensus in both the 1998 Plan and the most recent NW NPR-A lease sale.

I'm also mindful that in these modern times, we need to have jobs to feed our families, heat our homes and to buy clothing for everyone in the household. Considering the importance of wildlife resources from the Teshekpuk Lake area to our families, especially those without jobs and the fact that we have not succeeded in directing local residents to hundreds of oil field jobs available to us now. I am reluctant to say it's okay to move into the protected areas surrounding Teshekpuk Lake.

We also know there is a struggling bird population that will be disturbed, not to mention dislocation of the Teshekpuk caribou herd from its calving area where they are most likely to calve successfully. I believe that we can help more people through

counseling, training and education using resources currently available to us to take those jobs that exist now.

I'm not convinced that the potential benefits of oil and gas around Teshekpuk Lake area out weigh the benefits of maintaining wildlife resources that we all depend upon, even if there is oil and gas potential there. We have been told many times that revenues for our number one employer, the North Slope Borough, will continue to decline even if there is oil and gas development in our region. For the sake of our children and our future, we have to come up with other avenues to keep jobs here on the North Slope.

I would prefer to keep the current status of Teshekpuk Lake area in the NE NPR-A Plan offered in Alternative A for all of the reasons I have shared with you tonight. However, if our community agreed by consensus to another plan that is somewhere between A and B, I would be willing to live with a consensus plan.

I urge BLM and our leaders to move carefully into the Northeast section of the NPR-A instead of rushing to open up the Teshekpuk Lake area. There is too much at stake for everyone. Please take the time to meet us at the table before you do something to disrupt our livelihood.

Thank you.

(Marie Carroll translates in Inupiaq)

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Marie. (Applause) Our next speaker is Beverly Hugo. She's not here. Elsie Itta?

(Pause) KBRW Barrow.

**STATEMENT BY ELSIE ITTA**

Good evening and thank you for giving us the opportunity to say a few comments regarding the land that we live on.

My name is Elsie Itta and I am the Executive Director of Native Village of Barrow, northernmost federally recognized Tribal Government of the United States. Our corporate charter and constitution and by-laws were certified on March 21, 1940. Our tribal membership to date totals 3,044 and growing.

While my comments are very brief, I will say that before what I'm going to say here, is in the same line of thinking as what Edward had said earlier, it's with no malice, no hatred, it's just that I would like to bring out the truth.

The Inupiaq people represented by Native Village of Barrow, comprise of those who have direct ties to the people of the land from time immemorial. They have survived in one of the most harshest environments on top of the earth without revenue from oil and gas development, until recently. Furthermore, Native Village of Barrow cannot apply directly for any NPR-A Environmental Impact funds or apply at all due to the fact of its tribal government status and it's not a municipal or borough government.

We depend on our environment just as much as the environment depends on us. Inupiaq people have and still live, hunt and subsist off the land, rivers and the sea. After all, we look out for the land that we have been placed on.

We are not Russians and never were. We are Inupiaq.

How can one put a price to a way of life that has been?



What makes one think that a price can be put on a livelihood that has been in existence for thousands of years? It may work for your system, for you own good, not Native Village of Barrow.

We never consented to sell what provides for us. We were never consulted with or even acknowledged as People of the Land, the Inupiaq People. Our land is not for sale.

(Elsie Itta speaks in Inupiaq)

And one day we learn that Alaska was bought from Russia for over seven million dollars. When you think about it, really think about it, it makes you think we were -- I am not a Russian.

I'm Inupiat. And what made Russia think that they could sell us to another government?

Greetings. (Elsie Itta translates in Inupiaq)

I grew up with a grandmother who told me, don't worry about the land. After all, when I pass away, we don't take it with us, it remains here. And for those of us who are fortunate to live here, it is our duty to take care of it.

(Elsie Itta speaks in Inupiaq)

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Elsie. Richard Glenn?  
Beverly, I'll get to you after Richard.

**STATEMENT BY RICHARD GLENN**

Good evening. My name is Richard Glenn. I live here in Barrow. I'm Vice President of Lands for Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and I'm speaking here at the request of the president of ASRC, so tonight I have the privilege of speaking on behalf of ASRC.

Our comments will be presented in writing before the deadline, but for the purposes of tonight's meeting I would like to give you a brief summary of the direction that our comments will take.

(Richard Glenn speaks in Inupiaq)

Arnold's been quiet too long, when I'm done giving this summary in English, I'm going to ask Arnold to translate it for me. I've given him a text, a brief text of my comments and I think he's been -- he needs something to do.

I only have three things to say and I'll keep it brief. First, I would like to encourage the Bureau of Land Management to refer to the 1998 comments that were made by the ASRC regarding the Northeastern portion of NPR-A and its plans for leasing exploration development for oil and gas.

The comments had three important points. Our first point was that we were in support of responsible leasing and exploration of the entire Northeastern portion of NPR-A.

The second point was that in doing so, the BLM should consult in the strongest fashion possible with our local organizations. This means our villages, our municipalities and our tribal organizations.

And third, that if any leasing or exploration were to be done, that it be done in a way that it respects the Inupiat people, our ties to the land and the resources that we depend on, both for our nutrition and for our culture. The 1998 comments in general have that message.

We wish to provide those comments in the same context

with a few modifications. We support in general, the Alternative B that the BLM is presenting with these important exceptions:

One: we also support the leasing and exploration of these areas called the "nine townships" that are referred to as the Black Brant Lakes area. Leasing and exploration of these nine townships can be conducted in winter when the black brants are not present, no harm will occur to the molting geese, no harm will occur to caribou with calves if exploration is done in this area during the winter months.

Second: we support leaving Teshekpuk Lake alone. Especially this is important if -- if it's something that cannot be explored or developed safely, we recommend that it be refrained from any leasing program for the time being.

This is really -- these two issues, the lake and the areas that are either on or off limits for exploration or development is the opportunity to test this issue of performance based stipulations. If it can be done right then we should do it. If it can't be done right then we shouldn't.

A few more points before I close.

The North Slope communities depend on sustained exploration and development of oil and gas for the livelihood of our villages, our communities, our schools, our health clinics, our fire houses. Our North Slope residents know this message better than anyone. Our life and our governments depend on this balance of exploration and development and respect for our resources.

The problem is, who knows where the oil and gas is? This

question can't be answered until exploration takes place. This brings us back to the old message, the continuous message that we've supported for many years, that we encourage and advocate responsible exploration and development on land, on the North Slope.

You can look to the past ten years for some reasons for this position being taken by our Regional Corporation, and it's not any effort to drive up corporate revenues, corporate contracts, but it is about revenues for our communities. It is about jobs for our North Slope residents.

Unemployment is up and in the past ten years it's almost doubled in some of our villages, and it's going to get higher as our organizations, our community organizations have shrinking budgets. Our people who are needful now are going to be even more needful, and it's true that this increase in any development, any exploration, any discoveries will not offset the decline, but why make it even worse by removing areas that are available for exploration, by taking them away. Why make our problem worse?

Our future lies in partnering with development and this balance of respect and economic benefits. If we do not know before exploration takes place, where oil and gas accumulations are, how can we say that we've given up enough land for exploration or development? Exploration takes place first, then we can make reasonable decisions with a strong permitting, zoning, consulting powers that our government has.

Finally, one final point. And I say this with respect;

this land that has been up for discussion, and this evening's presentation is important, and you've heard heartfelt presentations on that, but all of our land is important. Which land is more important than another? Our people have been born and raised, lived and died along every major river drainage up and down the coast. If you draw a map of the North Slope, we would cover the area with our footprints, the graves of our ancestors and the lives of our children. Nevertheless, this area contains very important habitat for wildlife, very important lands for our people. We respect that. We expect the BLM and the industry to respect that.

Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: (Translates in Inupiaq) Beverly Hugo?

**STATEMENT BY BEVERLY HUGO**

(Speaks in Inupiaq)

CHAIR BROWER: Okay. Today we are left with the responsibility, as Beverly discussed here or mentioned in her comments, and we have to be prudent managers of our property, our land, because we survive on it, maintain our livelihood on the sustenance of our land because some of our parents are gone. And we expect the industry to be careful, really careful. Our tundra, our Arctic homeland is sensitive. In just tracking it you can see the imprint from a four-wheeler, from a snow machine, even from a roll-a-gon, I guess.

She is supporting the 1998 Stipulations as her choice for

management standards and policy for NPR-A Northeast corner. And we will work cooperatively with the industry, and we will consult with them as they will consult with us in any area of tracking on the tundra and NPR-A Northeast corner or NPR-A.

She feels that it is okay for exploration only to continue in our areas, including the green area for the geese molting area, in the winter only. Geese are a great dietary supplement to us and we can work together. And she is expressing the continuity of -- to protect the geese so it is stressed that the geese is a favorite dietary and nutritional supplement for our culture.

CHAIR BROWER: With that -- where am I? Robert Edwardsen?

**STATEMENT BY ROBERT EDWARDSSEN, SR.**

(Speaking in Inupiaq) And I just thank Nuiqsut people that we are seeing the poor things that they have been enduring for the last few years, and we are just beginning in the Arctic in Barrow. My biggest concern is the Nuiqsut people had hired -- I mean hollered for assurance, they wanted assurance that when they do have an accident, or when they do loose their hunting time due to development, how are they going to be assured that they're going to be covered for their subsistence food.

And I think it's... (speaking in Inupiaq) ...until they assure us that these things will not happen because we're taking a big gamble here 'cause it's very sensitive. We heard it from everybody, it's real sensitive. We want to be assured by our government that, you know, we just can't -- just because our

president wants to go trigger happy in some other country, you know, doesn't have to sacrifice our homeland. It's -- that's probably the ultimate truth of this, and I've done a lot of research and I've charter (ph) for the allotment of the Alaska North Slope, and the Northeast corner is not even in here because this was drawn up in November of '99. They've withdrawn that and I don't know where this Northeast corner is coming from, that's my question to the record of decision.

My question is, in the chart of the oil companies, the Northeast corner is not even mentioned in here. There is Southeast, Northwest and Central. And I just wondered where we're coming from when you established the Northeast corner? That's why we need to assure where all this is coming from. We need to be assured 'cause we just can't go pointing at which plan is good 'cause we -- they haven't guaranteed us that they will -- they are fail safe.

They have been, you know, I give the industry a applause for not having had big spills, and then there's some -- some of the stipulations they created like on Ikpikpuk, you know, on Ikpikpuk River is a migrating river. It migrates. It moves and sometimes it moves 300 feet a season. And they've got a half a mile, and then how long does it take to develop a field? 30 years. Prudhoe Bay has been going strong for 30 years, and still is. What is our -- these boundaries that they are putting at a half mile, three quarter of a mile on the rivers, erodes, I mean, you know, there's some real tough questions in there. But we know that the rivers still migrate. You will see how much the

rivers have moved within these years, they've moved miles.

And I just caution the industry that we look at this very carefully before we go into the Teshekpuk area. I just thank you guys for not being out in the Arctic Ocean, but we have been stressed out by the industry for so long and I think that's where all our white hairs are coming from, 'cause seasonally we always had -- we have never fired a shot at you folks (laughter) and you know, we -- we're fair people. And I just thank you -- I just want to thank BLM for always enduring in our community efforts, that we get together and it's -- but I will not decide until they assure us of these things, that we need to look into the assurance and, you know, I know just because somebody wants to start his car and that's the reason why we have to go through all this stress.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: (Translates in Inupiaq) James Patkotak?

**STATEMENT BY JAMES PATKOTAK**

Thanks, Arnold. James Patkotak for the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, Natural Resources Director. And I've already submitted my comments to BLM already. My written report, or comments I mean.

Good evening. The Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope is a federally recognized Regional Tribal Government, advocating for the membership within the Arctic Slope Borough in the State of Alaska, and having a common bond of association and interest, including Point Hope, Point Lay, Wainwright, Barrow, Nuiqsut,



Kaktovik, Anaktuvuk Pass and Atqasuk. And in order to promote our security and social welfare and advance and protect our common interests as the descendants of the aboriginal Inupiats within the area, I will comment on the proposed amendment to the Integrated Plan for the Northeast NPR-A established in 1998.

The protection of the proposed region's subsistence resources and environment has to be our number one concern when this type of action comes up which involves our very traditional and cultural ways are threatened by any sort of industrial development on our subsistence and land-use areas on the Arctic Slope.

The area that is being considered is identified as a sensitive area which requires heightened protection from potential impacts of oil and gas operations, especially the endangered Stellers and the Spectacle Eider ducks, the Oldsquaw, the different geese species that inhabits that area during the summer seasons will be impacted negatively forever when the infrastructure develops around Teshekpuk Lake. Including the Arctic Cisco and the Arctic Grayling in the rivers we subsist on for our nutritional needs as Inupiaq. The Arctic Cisco is of a concern to us, being that it is becoming scarce to catch in the nets of fishermen since the industry developed drill sites and man-made islands along the Outer Continental Shelf of the Arctic Slope, stretching from the vicinity of Barrow to the Demarcation Point, despite our protests for development.

All around the vicinity of Teshekpuk Lake, subsistence activities that occur during the winter season could be affected

by seismic exploration or exploratory drilling, fur trapping, furbearing trapping, fishing and opportune hunting. And also, the deep ruts left in the snow by seismic vehicles creates difficult terrain to traverse and results in snowmobile wear and tear, including the sleds being pulled behind them.

With a quote from the National Research Council report, there is a particular need for attention to the social and cultural efforts of leasing, exploration, development and production, including the gradual or long term changes that can be expected to take place even in the absence of spills as well as the broader range of socio-cultural disruptions that can result from a spill and persist for years.

And as a corollary, not enough effort has been devoted to the pragmatic questions of what steps if any, could be taken to avoid or lessen harmful consequences.

As being land-stewards, camp and cabin owners and subsistence harvesters on NPR-A, we prefer the No Action Alternative Plan.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the proposed amendment to the NPR-A Integrated Plan.

(James Patkotak translates in Inupiaq)

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you. Linda Wenning?

**STATEMENT BY LINDA WENNING**

My name is Linda Wenning and I've lived in Barrow since November of 2002, and I consider it my home.

I vote for no change. I would like to see Alternative A

prevail. I do think that 87 percent of the land is enough, and I don't see that on the 1998 Environmental Impact Statement, it was carefully thought out. It did not say, but if we see some oil on that last 13 percent we want that too. It was very carefully thought out.

I don't see any protection for the NOAA site that monitors air quality, and I'm not sure if that's in the Northeast quadrant or not. It was mentioned in the October 2003 hearings.

I do think that needs to be addressed.

When I look up here I don't see any wheat fields, I don't see any corn fields, I don't see any apple orchards, it's the animals. It's all about animals up here, not wheat fields. And if there's any error that happens with the oil development, we're talking genocide. The death of a way of life for a whole people, and I don't want to see that.

I think we've taken enough from the Native peoples in the United States and broken enough promises.

I also object to the joint publication with Conoco-Phillips and BLM for the slick advertisement that was in the newspaper. What is this? Are we already in the pocket of Conoco-Phillips? Is BLM an adjunct of Conoco-Phillips?

And also, I'm not sure that BLM is taking into proper consideration the importance of the Teshekpuk, which I have trouble saying, caribou herd. According to the economic study that is about ten years old now, and I don't expect it has changed much, the Teshekpuk Lake herd provides subsistence to the tune of 3,000 to 4,000 animals a year, and some of the further

south herds provide about 300 animals a year. So, you look at less people and more caribou, it's very very important.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: (Translates in Inupiaq) I see Warren, Warren Matumeak step right up.

**STATEMENT BY WARREN MATUMEAK**

(Speaks in Inupiaq) Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: Warren Matumeak, and he's -- a recap. The land management regulations from the time the Borough started the writing of the zoning, platting and regulations, a lot of it is based on true experience in vegetation and errors in Prudhoe Bay as a result of -- when there was no zoning and platting, those original documents, structures that are built there are evident that there were pre Title 19 structures. And so they're kind of obstructive, but the ones that are based on learning and those things where they have passages for caribou and fish and ducks and geese.

And he's been a land management administrative for a long period of time, especially in the wake of re-write and up to today. And he indicated that today Rex Okokak is now in that position.

Although the industry has fought and not agreed with the new developments, but they have learned to just work with the land managers of the North Slope Borough because this is something that went through court and the court directed them to abide by the land management administrator. And at this time, this is a strong policy, a strong regulatory agency for the

industry on the Arctic Slope and these have provisions for care and for wildlife management and provisions to protect wildlife as well. Insomuch as the industry does abide by letting caribou, a herd of caribou or caribou pass through passages before they continue onto their destination, including the Canadian White Goose.

And those are some of the things that he's -- I think these are valuable to know because the management regulations are based on historical data and facts. He did acknowledge some of the administrators in the back, those that have administered and been monitoring in the oil fields and industry as well.

Thank you, Warren. (Applause) And with that, I'll got to Douglas Edwardsen?

**STATEMENT BY DOUGLAS EDWARDSSEN**

Good evening. (Speaking in Inupiaq) I've got some questions? Who gave you the right to sell our birthright? Whose land is it? Our land, BLM's land? It's always been our land up here. Always. I don't see where you guys are coming from, or how to tell us to live up here. Come on. We've got to wake up somewhere. It's always been our land and we're the owners. Where are you guys coming from? Who gave you the right to sell our birthright? (Speaking in Inupiaq)

Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Douglas. (Applause) He's recanting a little bit in reference to what Warren Matumeak, that the industry does do a pretty good job in keeping their work area clean, whether they are in seismic work or production, and

they're awfully careful. But he's troubled about the -- who gave authority to the BLM that they could sell the Inupiaq territory.

This land, it's our land, this is where we provide sustenance for our livelihood, for our families, our people and we have been on this land from time of immemorial.

And this is something that was directed at Bob or Susan and what is right. Okay. Thank you, Douglas. And I will go to the next speaker, Paul Ningeok.

**STATEMENT BY PAUL NINGEOK**

Good evening. My name is Paul Ningeok. ICS member. I'm an ICS member, Native Village of Barrow member, UIC shareholder and ASRC shareholder.

I'd like to represent the young people. I'm young. I'm only 34. There are a lot of young people out there. This Bureau of Land Management, right, your seat, part of your job. Arnold Brower, Jr. I Paul Ningeok, give you respect. You are our ICS president, you represent us, Arnold Brower, Jr. We as adults support you, I think. We hope that Arnold Brower, Jr. run for your seat again.

There's an election going on in the future of ICS, me Paul Ningeok, give you support and all young adults hopefully give you support, and young at heart, elderly people. All ICS members hopefully give you a seat. Maybe you run for your seat again.

We don't mind if you go on vacation.

CHAIR BROWER: All right. Let's stick to this policy on the NPR-A.

MR. NINGEOK: Yeah. Okay. ICS, land management. Land management. I fight for my land and you represent us when you talk. When you talk, people listen. You are caring. We all listen. You are wise, caring, hard worker, problem solver, humble, helping, peaceful and understanding.

I'm going to get my education too someday, I'm going for my GED at the job center. That's a lot of positively (ph) out there. We young people just got to ask our elderly's and they will give you advice. I ask for advice from my elders, to go to school, to fight for my land. We all have land to deal with. We all have problems in our lives.

Well, I respect that. So, let's all give thanks to Arnold Brower, Jr. and let's all stand up and give thanks. Thank you. (Applause)

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Speech, Arnold. Speech.

CHAIR BROWER: (Laughter) Thanks, Paul, for your confidence and you young people should take -- take that to heart, and endeavor to learn about what's going on with our land and, you know, we have to learn. You have to learn. You have to come to these meetings, you young people that he spoke about. And that's, you know, I emphasize that quite heavily, whether you have a job or not you should participate in these meetings. This has to do with if you have a job or not, it's going to sustain your livelihood. Thank you.

Debbie Edwardsen?

MS. EDWARDSSEN: No. I didn't want to speak.

CHAIR BROWER: You did write that down.

MS. EDWARDSSEN: I thought I was supposed to sign in?

CHAIR BROWER: Okay.

MS. EDWARDSSEN: I can speak, but I wasn't planning to.

CHAIR BROWER: I'm just going to delete your name, Ma'am. Johnny Brower?

**STATEMENT BY JOHNNY BROWER**

Good evening. For the record, is this meeting being recorded? My Inupiat name is Nuvukunuk (ph). That's a name I carry very proudly because it was given to me by my elders. And my English name is Johnny Kunik (ph) Brower. My parents are Arnold Brower, Sr. and the late Emily Hopson Brower, Sr. My adopted parents are the late William and Viola Brower from Portland, Oregon. Son of my grandfather, Charles Toovak Brower's first wife's son.

And for the record, I would like to read a little bit of an old story or a letter pertaining to some of the subjects we're talking about tonight, I guess.

CHAIR BROWER: The subject tonight is the NPR-A Plan Amendment to the 1998 Policy that has been adopted.

MR. JOHNNY BROWER: And it's all about oil development and the interest in building it up. For the record, the letter dated September 15th, 1938. It says, Dear Misterns, and the letter is interviewing the following persons; Howard Berger, USIO teacher, Barrow, Alaska, Charles Brower, Trader, Commissioner Post Master, Barrow, Milford Keyston, USIO,



travelling field nurse, Wainwright, Oliver Morris, Trader, stationed at Helcutt (ph) in Barrow, Stanley Morgan, Signal Corps Officer, Barrow, Reverend F. G. Clair Cooper, Minister, Barrow, and Dr. Audie (ph) George, USIO, Physician, Barrow.

And I'm just going to briefly read on page 5 of the letter -- page 4 and 5, real minor things. A statement answered by Mr. Morgan. His number 5 answer on one of the questions. The development of the oil industry as a native project. And then on page 5, Claire Cooper's number's 2 answer to the question. Development of the oil industries. And mind you me, when I said this letter is dated September 15, 1938.

And for the records, I would like to use references on permit number 0922, which was given by Department of Interior to the Brower brothers, and the permit number 0848 as a reference, given to the Forest North Winter Herding Company. My mother's father, Al Hopson, Sr., permit holder on that one. And 0922 covers the entire terrain north and south side of Teshekpuk Lake, all the way up to the mountains. And the permit number 0848, the entire terrain of Meade River, from the head of Beard (ph) Bay to Demarcation Point.

And my serious question is, all this intrusion by the order of the United States Congress, given to the oil companies, and have studied the North Slope in search of oil and gas since the late 1800's to the 1950's, 40's and 50's. I am very objective about this. I do not like it because it all comes down to one thing, positively and it's the truth, they have trespassed into a very large reindeer herding and grazing ground that has

been given to families on the North Slope. And if World War II hadn't occurred it would have been a very healthy way of life.

Just because of the word, World War II started, Department of Defense has come up and divided (ph) up a lot of do-line (ph) sites in Alaska, Canada and Greenland. And mind you me, when I say I object to this because I've been sitting on the Department of Defense Restoration Advisory Board since 1996, and I do not like what I see. What should have been cleaned up a long time ago is -- but I'm kind of positively happy about some of it because they are in -- they have been spending some revenues in cleaning up. A lot of the areas where they had cleaned, and they turn around and come back and using oil companies to get back on the land.

The bottom line from my heart is, please consider the things that you trespass to, and please pay attention to the amount of money you need to transfer to these people because I, for one, I'm on a one-way street, I've been blessed by my grandfather Al Hopson, and my uncles from the Brower side, and I will not rest until the desires of their heart those rose, those who rest in the grave, be settled and taken care of.

Thank you. And mind you me, when I say settle the matter on the trespassing and contaminations you have put on my Native people. Take care of it. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: (Translates in Inupiaq) I see Ken Donjkowski.

MR. DONJKOWSKI: Donajkowski.

CHAIR BROWER: Donajkowski, okay.

**STATEMENT BY KEN DONAJKOWSKI**

Good evening. My name is Ken Donajkowski and I am the Health, Safety, Environmental Manager for Conoco-Phillips, Alaska.

Conoco-Phillips is the largest producer of oil and gas and it's the most active explorer in the State of Alaska. We have also been a long-time neighbor of the community of Barrow and I appreciate the opportunity to share my comments with you here tonight.

Our company has a proven track record of high quality environmental performance on Alaska's North Slope and in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. Conoco-Phillips is a leader in innovative solutions that protect the environment, such as the minimal footprint of the Alpine production facilities. Conoco-Phillips has participated in 15 exploration wells in the Petroleum Reserve, all without environmental incident.

In 2001, Conoco-Phillips and our partner Anadarko Petroleum announced several discoveries in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. Since that time, an Environmental Impact process has begun for new satellite field developments in both the National Petroleum Reserve and on state and Native corporation lands near the Alpine oil field. These new developments confirm the strategic potential for oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska.

As the draft plan points out, much has been learned since the Record of Decision for the Northeast area was first issued in 1988. Conoco-Phillips endorses continued leasing in the

Northeast portion of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska and the opening of Teshekpuk Lake by the BLM. This will allow access to some of the most important prospective areas, which are located near the crest of the Barrow Arch.

Conoco-Phillips believes that the most sensitive areas north of the Teshekpuk Lake, such as lakes with the highest use by molting geese, should remain off limits. We also acknowledge that there should be a buffer around these lakes as a further measure for protection of these species.

However, we are concerned that the BLM has recommended a blanket exclusion from leasing of the 350 square miles of additional prospective acreage north of Teshekpuk Lake.

We are also concerned that BLM has not addressed some of the extensive stream setbacks in the area. In our opinion, the current three-mile setback of Fish Creek is unnecessary and is double the 1.5 miles originally recommended in the 1998 Plan.

Conoco-Phillips does support the BLM's proposed "performance-based" stipulations and required operating procedures for the Northeast NPR-A. These revised stipulations would provide a framework to make compliance efforts more efficient, where we can continue to operate in a safe and environmentally sound manner and respect the important subsistence usage of that area.

Conoco-Phillips remains committed to environmental excellence and responsible development. Exploration activities in the proposed northeast environmentally sensitive areas would take place with minimal impacts, using ice roads and ice pads to

access prospects during the Arctic winter.

Future oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska will have economic benefits for Alaska, for the communities of the North Slope, as well as for the nation. For more than 30 years, oil and gas development has been the economic engine for the North Slope Borough and the State of Alaska.

In 2003, the State of Alaska received more than a billion from the oil industry in taxes and royalties. The three previous lease sales in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska have generated more than \$222 million in bonus payments, split between the state and federal governments. Clearly, in our view, continued investment on the North Slope benefits everyone who lives in Alaska, through monies for state and local governments that result in better services and better schools.

Conoco-Phillips also understands that economic benefit from continued oil and gas development is only part of the picture. We are keenly aware that the land and water of the North Slope, and the subsistence environment and traditions it supports, are fundamental to the Native culture. These values must continue to be a vital part of our collective future.

Conoco-Phillips has proven that we can work closely with our neighbors and operate in a manner that respects the way of life of the residents of Alaska's North Slope. This takes constant effort on both parts and we are committed to working with the North Slope residents to ensure development happens in a way that respects their heritage and their subsistence way of life.

In conclusion, Conoco-Phillips is pleased to offer these comments. Continued lease sales in the National Petroleum Reserve will enhance the nation's energy and economic security, and our nation needs to secure its energy future. We are confident that the Bureau of Land Management and the residents of the North Slope will find a way to balance the needs of the nation with the needs of the Native people. Conoco-Phillips pledges to see that the balance defined from this effort is the balance that is maintained for generations to come.

Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Ken. (Translates in Inupiaq) I see Charles Okakok?

**STATEMENT BY CHARLES OKAKOK**

Good evening. Charlie Okakok. (Speaking in Inupiaq)  
Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Charlie Okakok, for the record. He talked about that there is some illnesses that has come into light in the North Slope. And these have been attested by folks in Nuiqsut on previous hirings, on subsistence resources. However, he was ignored by state agencies and federal agencies such as NEPA.

We need to institute a clean water act and a clean water act to be studied and to monitor our plan and resource and air because NEPA -- NEPA's authorities prefer to -- the language -- and strengthen the language and he has reviewed some work on ill-related issues on renewable resources. These illnesses will

eventually visualize -- since those toxins exist in fishes in previous studies of fishes and rivers and lakes and animals. And they will have delayed effect on the subsistence user, namely the tribe.

Consultation issues on government to government policy is not utilized to the extent that it should and seems to be only towards -- geared towards the North Slope Borough.

There aren't any social workers related to impacts on alcohol and drugs, and these should be -- employees should be visible that are working on these from social impact funds. And it is a detriment to our society that, as a result, 30 percent at least, in a quota of employment in NPR-A, it should be a beginning talking point for -- if we are truly -- if the BLM and the government is truly going to try to make beneficial -- benefits towards the residents of the Arctic Slope. So, some form of quota, at least in the 30 percent range would acknowledge that there are -- that we will get some jobs as a result.

We need to make more of the social impact, aid more visible through -- from this development.

Fishes that have cancer causing illness, you know, we will eventually pay for all of this from our health.

And then our issues on the lands with Viet Nam Veterans Native Allotment Act that BLM has started to deny these lands for the Alaska Native Viet Nam Veterans, which are on NPR-A Allotments. And no other work should be performed or continued until this resolution is made on behalf of the Alaska Native Viet Nam Veteran's allotments are confirmed.

And these permit issued on this development, has to have studies that -- to study these cancer producing ailments that are in fishes or are in our renewable resources.

I'm not sure if I took that one well enough, Charlie.  
(Speaking in Inupiaq)

Okay. The next one is Edith Vorderstrasse. And after Edith will be George Edwardsen. And then, just for the record, and then Max Ahgeak if you're still here, and then Taqulik Hepa and then Janice Meadows and then William Itta.

**STATEMENT BY EDITH VORDERSTRASSE**

These podiums are not made for small, short people.

CHAIR BROWER: I apologize for BLM.

Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity to speak on the amended EIS on the Northeast National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska Plan.

After hosting several meetings here in Barrow, with the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, Native Village of Barrow, the North Slope Borough Wildlife Department, and the Inupiat Corporation and community members. Our community consensus was that they were in favor of Alternative A. This plan was adopted in 1998 with the consensus and with working together as a community with other villages, as you collected testimony, this plan came to place.

BLM needs to provide us an opportunity to work cooperatively with them to come up with a careful comprehensive review of all scientific information and traditional local knowledge.



Alternative A was established in 1998 after a very careful review of everyone who had great concerns of the goose molting areas, caribou calving and insect relief habitat, the Teshekpuk Lake, which is a home to a lot of our fish. According to Volume II of the amended EIS Northeast NPR-A, record of decision, the original plan of the Northeast took almost two years. And now you have this amendment before us? We feel very strongly that this plan needs to be worked with our communities who will be impacted by this lease sale. The same process needs to take place because you are looking at an area that we have said, no action, that it says no action on the plan, but there is some action to it. And those were stipulations that came together with the hard work of the whole North Slope people. And I think, we as a community, should have that opportunity again so that we can address areas that are of great concern to us.

And my question to you is, what new wildlife or subsistence data or industrial technology has been reported since the 1998 Plan that would justify opening this area? I don't feel you have provided us adequate information to justify opening this area, and I would really like to see BLM make the effort to work with us so that we who will be impacted in a great way will have an opportunity to say, maybe this is an alternative. Maybe we can work this area. We can give and take, but we have to come together. It just can't be given to us and say these are the alternatives.

I think you have heard several testimonies tonight requesting that opportunity, and I hope that you will seriously

take that into consideration because we as a community, as people from the North Slope, this is vital to our subsistence way of life. It is vital to birds and caribou, birds who fly all the way from Russia, from what we have been told. And even though there is oil industry and we know it's coming, we ask that you carefully review this so that we will have this opportunity for our people here on the North Slope which will be largely impacted.

The oil industry will come and go, but will we? We will live here. We will still be here even if when the oil is gone. This home to us. And that's one of the reasons why it's so important that we have this opportunity to have collaboration with you and with anyone who is involved in this area.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Mayor. (Translates in Inupiaq) I see George Edwardsen?

**STATEMENT BY GEORGE EDWARDSSEN**

Good evening. Before I start, could I ask who is here? Is BLM here?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MR. EDWARDSSEN: Is BIA here, Bureau of Indian Affairs here because I saw the Native Village here and Inupiat Community, and they're supposed to be here when this kind of a gathering?

MS. CHILDS: No.

MR. EDWARDSSEN: Is there any U.S. Fish and Game? Is there any Federal Fish and Game here? No? Alaska Fish and

Game?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. EDWARDSSEN: Okay. The Alaska Fish and Game and BLM is here. And I have one more question, that green section on that map over there, that -- is that already sold? That section that we're talking about, north of the Teshekpuk already sold?

MS. CHILDS: No.

MR. EDWARDSSEN: It's not sold yet.

CHAIR BROWER: Are you talking about on the A Alternative?

MR. EDWARDSSEN: Yes. Okay. It's just an Alternative?

CHAIR BROWER: Yeah. This is Alternative A. The second one is B and the third one over there is Alternative C.

MR. EDWARDSSEN: Okay. It's not sold yet?

CHAIR BROWER: No.

MR. EDWARDSSEN: Okay. Good. Under Title 25, when the federal government comes here to talk to people, and if Native Village of Barrow or if -- or the Inupiat Community is here, the BIA is supposed to be here under Title 25. That's U.S. -- that's CFR. And they're not here.

And I agree with you, your exploration, you do it very safely. You do it in the winter time, that is more than true. And the only biggest problem I have with that is you have 3 million gallons of gray water you dump on the ground now. And when you look at 3 million gallons of, you know, sewage and dish

wash water, and you leave it on the ground, it gets pretty dangerous for the fish. The ground is very flat. We live in a flat ground and all the water that is put on top of the surface goes to the rivers. It works its way to the rivers and to the lakes.

When I was young and being taught how to fish by my uncle up at the Chipp River, one time one of us washed our hands in the dish wash basin with soapy water and we went down to the river and rinsed our hands in the river and for 24 hours we never got fish in our nets that day just from rinsing our hands in the river. That's how sensitive that Aanaaklliq that we catch, that white fish we eat. And you're looking at dumping 3 million gallons of gray water on the ground?

And you talked about buffer zones, a quarter of a mile, a half a mile, if there's a hill three miles away, anything from that hill, from the high spot of that hill towards you is going to flow into the river. So a quarter mile, three quarters of a mile, half a mile, is not a good safe number to talk about when you're going to be dumping your gray water and doing your exploration in.

And like I said, your exploration might be done safely, but you know you're going to strike oil in the area you want to go to, because the Navy has done its exploration and it's -- they've already showed you where the oil is.

Now, let's look at what's going to happen after you discover the oil: you're going to have to lay roads, you're going to have to lay gathering systems, you're going to have to

lay buildings, you're going to have to lay pipelines. And when you start laying pipelines, then you start harassing animals like spectacled eiders, steller eiders, snow geese, the peregrine falcon, those kind of animals are going to be bothered. When I, as a person, shoot one of those animals I can get fined up to \$10,000 and put in jail up to five years. What does the industry get when they damage those animals? What do they get? Nothing.

You might give them maybe a \$10,000 fine, but heck, that's the price of developing, it's very affordable. But me, that live here, I go to jail.

And, you know, I just -- when you look at Naval Petroleum Reserve of Alaska, it used to be Naval -- PET 4. When PET 4 was created through an executive order there was -- the United States came to this town, there was no boroughs, there was no state, we were even barely a territory, people would barely admit we were a territory. But there was an executive order that created PET 4.

The United States said they needed PET 4 because they were going into war and they needed oil and there was a potential for oil up here in the North Slope. Because in the past, you know, our ancestors found it. Some of them used to go there and take it up for their fuel where they would burn it for heating. That was known.

And then with the understanding that when the war efforts are -- when the need is no longer there, the property would be given back to this community. That's where they came -- they came to this community and said this. But somewhere along the line the federal government -- that executive order was never

followed and they created NPR-A and then gave it to the State of Alaska. Now since when did Barrow become the State of Alaska?

And when you start your development and you endanger those animals that are endangered -- that are on the threatened or endangered species list, when I do it I become a criminal. What are you when you allow it to be done? What is BLM? What is the State of Alaska? When they allow these threatened animals to be endangered you are a criminal too. And it becomes premeditated because you plan it ahead of time.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: George Edwardsen. (Translates in Inupiaq) Thank you, George. Max Ahgeak?

**STATEMENT BY MAX AHGEAK**

Good evening. Thank you for giving us the time. I'm Max Ahgeak, President and CEO of UIC (indiscernible) Corporation. I grew up in Barrow, mostly here in Browerville though.

What kind of a time frame do we have on these EIS, what you're working on right now? Can I ask?

MR. SCHNEIDER: The comment period ends on the 23rd.

MR. AHGEAK: The 23rd. And what kind of a time frame are we looking at, the time table, about when you want to bring this amendment forward?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We would like to complete the whole process by the end of the calendar year.

MR. AHGEAK: So, that will give us enough time for us to -- I'm leaning toward Alternative A, and that had a lot

of work done on it and we can get to -- like everybody did, making that Alternative A. I believe we can get to a point where we can all have a workable plan that's going to appease everybody.

So, I would encourage that you guys have more meetings and come up with another plan to enhance Alternative A.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. BROWER: (Translates in Inupiaq) The next one is Mae M. Akpik.

**STATEMENT BY MAE M. AKPIK**

(Speaking in Inupiaq) Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Martha Akpik is the daughter of Cora and Luther Levitt. She's the past teacher on subsistence culture for our young people here in Barrow. And one thing that's taught from elders and from parents, is that don't put soap in the river. Don't put these things that will obstruct and damage the eco system in our waters because we depend on the fish in the water. Keep the water clean.

These are our renewable resources and depend on biological nutrients of our land, where than land has several elements in its ecology from plants, bugs and those things are dependent upon by fishes and birds and little animals. And it's the essence of the Arctic environment.

Although the oil industry has -- the oil has benefits, we need to consider the management procedures, the language and the cumulative impacts because this -- we just spoke about land, if we talk about the ones on the water that are seals and ugruks,

and we have to use these seals and ugruks to mend our -- and structure our whaling boats. The skin of the ugruk is made out of the -- is used for the whaling boats. And the sinew of the caribou is required to sew these ugruks together for the whaling boat. And this sinew and the caribou, as it depends on the lichen, it has to have its nutrition. So we're talking about all of our ecological land, which has a -- and we cannot afford to disrupt the Arctic eco system's biological benefits for our culture, for our traditional way of life because it's the fabric of our traditional way of life.

And this is something that we -- when we talk about these impacts and issues that we are concerned about, we're concerned more about something else that is relative to the livelihood of these species we depend upon.

She appreciates the privilege to talk with the oil industry and the BLM and the developers so we can receive and discuss these issues that are so vital for our -- our subsistence way of life, because these need to be incorporated into the management procedures by BLM. And you need to -- they need to critically understand what this means to us as a people. This non-renewable resource for example, I might add on her behalf, is a one time thing. So that, when it is gone and you start to contaminate and disrupt the eco system, virtually it will end up perhaps with a desert, just like the Sahara Desert.

So, we need to have some monitoring and you need to be able to monitor this with us. You need to remain up here. And those impacts, those after care things have to be implemented and



finance perhaps, to maintain the social fabric and the biological fabric of our Arctic environment.

CHAIR BROWER: Janice Meadows? I already crossed your name off, Taqulik. Taqulik? Okay. We'll go back to the schedule. Taqulik Hepa, and then Janice.

MS. TAQULIK: Okay.

**STATEMENT BY TAQULIK HEPA**

Okay. Thank you, Arnold. For the record, my name is Taqulik Hepa. I'm the daughter of Margaret and Tom Opie and the granddaughter of Cora and Luther Levitt. I was born and raised in Barrow.

I also work for the North Slope Borough, Department of Wildlife Management, and I've been with that department since 1991. Today I will keep my comments brief since we're getting close to midnight.

First of all, I am concerned about the timing of this process, BLM has not given the residents and the rest of the United States residents enough time to adequately review this extensive document.

During the development of the 1998 final EIS, North Slope leaders were given a unique opportunity to provide local input into the document. We worked hard to make sure that our subsistence interests were protected the best we could. Although we were not all totally satisfied, we came to consensus on 79 stipulations. Others have spoken of that process today, which included the North Slope Borough, our Tribal Governments, communities from Atkasuk, Barrow, Nuiqsut and Wainwright. We all

played a role in this.

I strongly recommend that BLM consider a process to allow the leadership of the North Slope to play a meaningful role in the development of a final decision on this amended plan.

And I also want to talk that this process seems so much rushed as it did in 1998. That process, I believe was an 18 month process. This one is so short and we can't even come to a consensus, you know, amongst our own communities. The other day we tried to meet with the leadership of just from Barrow, we came close, but we came to realize that we just don't have enough time to come up with a unified position even just for Barrow. So, seriously think about that as a recommendation to BLM.

What new scientific research or new industrial technology has been conducted since the 1998 final EIS in order for BLM to justify opening the areas that are now close to leasing or surface facilities? I believe BLM has not shared this information with the people who are going to be most impacted. This information should be shared and discussed with the affected North Slope communities.

The subsistence workshop held in Nuiqsut during the 1998 EIS process was a good example of sharing new or existing research data. And more importantly, it gathered traditional knowledge from local hunters on the affected area.

There's two areas that I'm really concerned about, a lot of other things, but two areas that I want to mention. There are two narrow corridors on the east and west sides of Teshekpuk Lake that are very important to caribou. During the summer months the

caribou depend on those corridors to reach insect relief and summer feeding areas. As others have stated tonight, I strongly recommend that those areas remain closed to leasing.

The other area is Teshekpuk Lake. To my knowledge, there has been very few research done in that, you know, to consider the importance of that lake, and more research needs to be done.

So I also recommend that the lake be closed to leasing.

Lastly, I want to emphasize that it is a very hard position for the people of the North Slope that we're faced with here today. And I have thought of the many positives in which oil and gas development has given to our people, and I am very thankful for the things that it has given us, but I also recognize that there are many negatives, such as the risk that we put our subsistence lifestyle in and the resources. And I feel that if we can't stop oil and gas development and exploration, we should at least be in a position to help make sure that it's done right.

Just two more other things that I wanted to mention was, why doesn't BLM have an office or an employee on the North Slope to deal with those issues? Here we go into another process and it's been brought up at many meetings and they keep saying that they have the money or that they have the position, but I still don't see a BLM employee here.

When you look at other areas of the state, such as in Kotzebue or Bethel, Dillingham, Nome, they have BLM offices, but when you consider the amount of land that they're leasing up here on the North Slope, there's something wrong because you don't see

them leasing these -- that much land in those other areas of the state. There's justification and there's people that have concerns that need to be heard.

The last thing I wanted to mention is that this commenting process, by the time our comments are heard in Washington, D.C., it's very funneled out, so I don't think our message that, you know, in all the comments that we've been saying over the years isn't being adequately heard to the people in D.C. who make those decisions. Some of those folks need to come and listen to the people of the North Slope.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Taqulik. Janice Meadows? (Translating in Inupiaq) Janice? Janice Meadows.

**STATEMENT BY JANICE MEADOWS**

My name is Janice Meadows. I have lived here in Barrow most of my life, and from the time that I heard my father (indiscernible) say there was a lot of oil on our lands, it never occurred to me that we would be here discussing and meeting about it because this was when I was about 12 years old.

I grew up going to camp to subsist for fish, caribou and waterfowl. My grandfather taught my father how to hunt whales, seals, walrus and so on, and these subsistence activities have been passed onto our younger generation, especially my son, my brothers and sisters and the siblings that we have.

To what degree do the Inupiat people have to tell the federal government that we want to protect our lands? It's been stated over and over again that the stipulations set in 1998

should not be changed. We want to protect our lands because if we do not speak out for protection of the lands from where we get our food, we would not be caretakers. The Inupiat people are stewards of our lands and we want our generations that follow to be able to subsist as we have.

With no action Alternative we are compromising our livelihood and subsistence way of life so that there will be oil and gas development that we can live with. With this Alternative we are making sure that the Inupiat people will continue to subsist with no long term detriment to our resources.

Please take notice that Teshekpuk Lake is the core habitat of what we subsist on. This area supports the caribou, fish and waterfowl habitats. If this area is disturbed, you have no idea what detrimental effects it will have on our resources in the long run.

In closing, no action Alternative was a long process and it reflects our people's values and traditions, keep it that way.

I forgot to mention that I'm also presently the Executive Director for Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope.

(Translates a portion in Inupiaq) Thank you for this opportunity.

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you, Janice. (Applause)  
(Translates in Inupiaq) I see William Itta. Bill?

**STATEMENT BY WILLIAM ITTA**

(Speaks in Inupiat) ....discord brought to our people, I'm glad it's over. I'm very thankful that it's just about over. And I -- Conoco-Phillips, thank them for having their

representative over here, and I'm very sad to see some of the major players who are going to be in the NPR-A exploring not here like Totel (ph), which is about three times as big as you folks.

There was once a time when the oil industry was a good industry. It had -- they showed a lot of respect to the people who owned this land, Atlantic Richfield had good verbiage in their policies and there was a lot of people from here that went to work. A lot of people had their own Twin Otter, but once the Texans came everything got different, the sticky fingers men from Texas. (Speaking in Inupiaq)

I know a lot of Atlantic Richfield people because I worked for them for about seven years and I'm glad they brought a representative up here to listen to the concerns. It's not very often.

I would like to give my thanks to giving us an opportunity to speak. And to the folks, (speaking in Inupiaq) good fishing.

Good night. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: We appreciate Bill's comments because he's a resident of Teshekpuk Lake area and the neighborhood is Puviaq. And he wants to emphasize to Bob and BLM that Puviaq is less than a half a mile into the river, so this is something that if we're going to set a policy, an NPR-A Northeast, we already are maybe breaking that policy in Puviaq.

I don't know how we came out that, but that has already happened there. So he's concerned about fish that is -- the planes hovering over the Puviaq -- the Miyoriak River, and found

out it was a fish study.

He alluded to much of the traditional sites, historical sites in the Miyoriak area into the mouth of the Teshekpuk Lake.

He is very cognizant and wants to protect the eastern Teshekpuk area, calving area, because this area has been predominantly been used for a roll-a-gon trail and this is a no -- it's already starting to disrupt our -- if we select an alternative where no action is required, then this is -- you need to find an alternate route for the roll-a-gon systems that will not alter and harass caribou migration routes.

Because we are dependent upon the land, Inupiat people, the subsistence hunter needs sovereign use of the traditional lands to sustain their livelihood. And although these Native Allotment camp sites are there, those are just resting places not a livelihood place for -- so that we are about in some parts of the NPR-A trying to sustain and harvest game for dietary and nutritional supplements for our families.

He thanks for the privilege to be able to speak tonight.

CHAIR BROWER: Richard, you will have to say your last name.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Hutchinson.

**STATEMENT BY RICHARD HUTCHINSON**

I just wanted to testify about my experiences within the oil industry. I know the Conoco-Phillips representative had stated that they have a good environmental policy, a good clean policy, and from my viewpoint from within working for the companies, I've seen time and again from Atigan Pass where they

would cover up a spill or mis-report the amount of the spill, and I've seen that from Atigan River all the way to Nuiqsut over and over again. And I just hope they realize that their, you know, it's a lie what he said that they don't -- they don't spill or anything like that.

Also, that the United States doesn't rely upon the rule of law to have authority. They rely upon the threat of violence in order to enforce the rule of law, or enforce their -- enforce their decision-making. So, I would hope that everybody would be prepared to take your concerns to the international community in order to gain some support other than from the United States or the State of Alaska.

That's all I have.

CHAIR BROWER: Thanks for your comment. Richard Hutchinson (translates in Inupiaq) Harry Brower? Okay. He's going to let Jenny Ahkivgak be first.

**STATEMENT BY JENNY AHKIVGAK**

(Speaking in Inupiaq) Thank you.

CHAIR BROWER: Jenny Ahkivgak, she's a 50 year resident in Barrow, Alaska. She migrated from Sagavanirktok River area to Barrow. She was listening to Warren Matumeak's comments and she's rather pleased about all of the discussions that has happened and supports them. And she had a lot to say before and she's wants to inform or let you know that she's -- she likes and prefers subsistence foods and we want you to know that we rely and depend on it for our dietary and nutritional supplements from our land.



And she thanks you for the opportunity and privilege to speak tonight.

CHAIR BROWER: Okay. Harry Brower, Jr.?

**STATEMENT BY HARRY BROWER, JR.**

Just think, Bob, we're starting a brand new day and we need a new agenda for the new day. (Laughter) Your agenda adjourned at 9 p.m. earlier this evening.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think we're going to have to pay rent on the building for the next day too.

MR. BROWER: Okay. Anyway, good evening, my name is Harry Brower, Jr., and I'm a resident of Barrow. I wear different hats in the community. I'm a Commissioner for Barrow under the Alaska's Whaling Commission. I'm chairman for the Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. I also work for the Department of Wildlife Management with the North Slope Borough as a subsistence research specialist, or coordinator I should say, I've changed titles since -- a few years.

Anyway, I want to make a few brief comments on some of the issues that have been discussed. And I would like to thank the previous comments and testimonies that were given. Again, those are heartfelt comments and this is an area that is very important to our people on the North Slope, and I know you've heard it many times tonight, and the resources that come from this area.

I wanted to kind of start backwards. I'm not going to state whether I support any of the Alternatives. I would like to continue the comments on, you know, for BLM to be able to come

back to Barrow and consult with the community as was done before in the past. It took, you know, you heard it before, it's -- it took two years to come up with that Alternative, the no action Alternative which is stated by BLM. There was a lot of activity and action taken on those stipulations and comments that were provided to get that area closed off. It wasn't -- so it would have been a different matter, but it's noted that it's a very important and productive area. So, we took a lot of measures to get to the terms and putting those stipulations placed in this area for those reasons. And we would like to see that continue.

We also have our economy and that's definitely going down because of its oil based, you know, based on oil. The revenue and incomes for our local governments that need to continue. Although it's going to be limited income, we also need to continue employment for our people. We have a lot of people that are unemployed. You've heard it also tonight, that the unemployment is at a very high rate.

Anyway, some of the information that's been provided in the Environmental Impact Statement, it discusses performance based mitigation and required operating procedures, those are some of the information that are within this document and we need to be assured -- like I commented earlier, we need to be assured how those required operating procedures or before performance based mitigation measures are going to be protecting us. We need to do some ground (indiscernible) on some of this stuff.

And looking at -- I know we mentioned them in some other meetings, but this was not with the involvement of the

communities, the community members. There was very few specific people in the meetings that heard about these issues, but they still need to be brought out with the community and the different organizations that are going to be affected from the decisions that are made on this environmental impact statement.

All exception clauses must be eliminated or significantly narrowed. That's why we're here today, it's because of an exception clause that was placed on this Environmental Impact Statement. That's what brought us here to begin with and we've made that -- if that was the case and this had been made known there would have been some different discussions from community members, I think that's a very -- the heart of the matter that needs to be discussed and open -- the different agencies and the government people here regarding those exception clauses, you know, it's -- it's the cause of why we're here today. It was an exception clause that was being put into the Environmental Impact Statement that provided the BLM to make a change within a couple of years. I think that needs to be considered very carefully.

Another point is that small points of decisions can have a big impact on management. That needs to be looked into. Definitions of consultation was never including one party simply informing another on it's intentions. I think that needs to be understood very carefully. And you know, be diligent about talking to the community members that are heads of these organizations in consultations processes, not just with one person but the group that are in that organization. Let's be -- needs to have the basic understanding of what's been discussed

through -- if it's regarding this Environmental Impact Statement or different lands or the stipulations that are within this Environmental Impact Statement. Those need to be looked into very carefully.

Cumulative Impacts need to be addressed. There's impacts that have been associated from some of this activity that hasn't even been addressed and yet we're continuing regardless of what's happening. We're progressing forward with the activity that interests you, or the federal government wanting to get into some areas without acknowledging the cumulative impacts. Those need to be addressed at some point in some.

I think that the terms used for the cabins and campsites need to be readdressed at some time. I think those camps and cabins have been established by subsistence users that have used these areas for many years, generations passed on by families, it's not cabins and campsites just by accident. These are traditional land use areas that have cabins in them because they have strategic location for being able to access resources out in wherever they may be. It's, you know, passed down from generation to generation. These campsites or cabins have been established because of repeated use over the years by families. And instead of living in tents all the time we needed something more protective to put in these areas, that's why we built the cabins. So the campsite and cabins is a misstatement, it needs to be considered as traditional land use sites. I think that's an important issue that needs to be addressed.

I think you've heard pretty much about the protecting the

resources from -- regarding caribou and the birds within that area. I think you've got that message fairly clear.

I think I will cut off here. I think there's probably a couple more issues that I would like to bring up, but I can get by and probably provide them in written comments.

Thank you for your time. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Thank you. Okay. The last person we have is Craig George.

MR. GEORGE: I'll try and be mercifully brief.

CHAIR BROWER: Good. Craig?

**STATEMENT BY CRAIG GEORGE**

Good evening, or good morning. My name is Craig George, I'm a wildlife biologist with the North Slope Borough, Department of Wildlife Management. I've worked for over 20 years, mainly studying bowhead whales, but I have been involved in some fisheries work and I was glad to hear some of the comments made earlier.

So, I would like to make a few, regarding fish. I would like to make a few points regarding the importance of fish as a subsistence resource in the NPR-A and some other general observations.

It's generally not well known that fish are one of the staples of the coastal Inupiat diet on the North Slope. The public outside -- our communities here is mainly about the dependence of Marine mammals. In particular, the broad white fish or Aanaakliq, is one of the most important subsistence resources in the central part of the Slope, much of which falls

within NPR-A. Broad white fish from the NPR-A region are also traded among other communities, so this resource really has Slope-wide significance.

I've been studying broad white fish, working on these various projects and learning from local fisherman for a number of years. They're extremely interesting fish, they're very long lived and in our area on the North Slope they mature at about age 12 and live up to 40 years and achieve about 10 pounds or more and are very good tasting regardless of their preparation. They migrate considerable distances and use a variety of habitats.

The central part of the North Slope, and specifically the NPR-A is more or less the center of concentration for this species on the Slope.

And as I mentioned, they require a number of habitats through their lifetime, these include deep river habitat for spawning and over-wintering, rivers and streams migration corridors, near shore (indiscernible) habitat for feeding, for certain size classes and lakes for feeding and over-wintering. And to reach these lakes many will use small seasonal streams for access.

As an example, in the Northeast Planning area, small seasonal creeks feed the Miyoriak (ph) River that Billy had mentioned, and they are very important and need careful protection. That's where we've gotten a lot of the highest catch rates in our studies are in these feeder rivers. Some of them are quite small.

Protection can generally be achieved by bridging small

creeks rather than using culvert pipes. It's more expensive to do this, but clearly necessary for this important resource and we look to BLM to insure that stipulations are properly enforced.

From a cooperative telemetry study dealing with the DNR and the state through NPR impact funds, we have the data that clearly demonstrates all of the -- all of the things I just addressed on the various habitats used. We have some data to show the importance of Teshekpuk Lake, the fish, the Borough has initiated a lot of the work on that area.

The western area, we have some evidence of over-wintering of broad white fish in that region. And the eastern area, the earlier studies that we did in the 90's shows that they are rearing and feeding areas for a number of species. So far we have identified at least 12 species in the lake.

And as Tuk mentioned, although it's the third largest lake in Alaska, there's very little scientific work that has been done on the lake to date. In fact most of it has been done by our department oddly enough. For these reasons and many of the other issues associated with the development in the lake itself, it's premature in my opinion, to allow leasing of the lake basin itself.

And just some general comments. I think we have some evidence that wildlife issues can be by in large adequately mitigated using various approaches, but I don't know that we know how to deal with the effects of development on people and subsistence use. We know this from the Prudhoe experience, and perhaps this is an over simplification, it is, but the wildlife

is there, but the hunters aren't. And the Nuiqsut community is not using much of its former hunting area to the east.

I often hear -- well, we've heard a lot of testimony about changes that occur when development moves in and we want to learn from this experience and avoid -- learn from those lessons and avoid some of the changes that have occurred earlier. And we need to do something differently in NPR-A obviously than has been done to date.

NPR-A and the Northeast area is generally the most heavily populated portion of the Slope. If you look at a map of the North Slope, you'll see that -- and look at the traditional land use sites, you'll see that the heaviest concentration is in the NPR-A region, and this is mainly because it has the highest densities of wildlife on the Slope with the large coastal plain and thousands of lakes and rivers. Any development in this area would have to -- has to be conducted very carefully obviously.

Anyway, for the reasons that I have given, I feel like the -- as Harry mentioned, that the process to really consider this on this EIS has been too rapid and I would recommend delaying the process long enough for the community to reach some consensus on these tough issues and allow proper research in the sensitive areas.

Thank you. That's all. (Applause)

CHAIR BROWER: Are you going to submit the computer for the record? (Laughter)

MR. GEORGE: No.

CHAIR BROWER: Anybody else before we close the



public hearing? (Speaking in Inupiat) ...and the listening audience, I know it's into the wee hours of the morning, but I'll give you the update again on how you can submit your comments. You have listened to the comments from the residents of Barrow. Also, for the record, we also have a disk that is available in the back and you can order a disk through the letter to the Bureau of Land Management and you can write to Susan Childs, and her address is Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Office, 222 West Seventh Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7599, and request for the CD for your computers if you would like to submit this and review this presentation in your computer, or you can go to the website by pressing (<http://nenpra.ensr.com>) and you can review the whole presentation on the computer under its website.

So, there are varied -- several ways you can do that and you can also contact Susan Childs at (907) 271-1985 and ask for information before the deadline of August 23, 2004.

And I appreciate everybody who was listening and has made comments, and I now close the public hearing for the Barrow part of the Bureau of Land Management, Northeast National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska NPR-A Plan Amendment.

(Off record)

MR. PAULUS: Good evening. I w \* \* \* **END OF**  
**PROCEEDINGS \* \* \***

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA                   )  
   ) ss.  
STATE OF ALASKA                                 )

I, Janice S. Scott, Notary Public in and for the State of  
Alaska and Reporter with Metro Court Reporting, do hereby  
certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 83 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Public Hearing before the Bureau of Land Management, was taken by me and transcribed by me.

THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the request of  
ENSR International, 1835 South Bragaw Street, Suite 490,  
Anchorage, Alaska.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 30th day of August, 2004.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED BY:

---

Janice S. Scott

Notary Public in and for Alaska

My Commission Expires: 01-31-08